

Title: **Friday, March 27, 1998 Chief Electoral Officer Search committee**

Date: 98/03/27

9:03 a.m.

[Mr. Langevin in the chair]

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I'd like to call the meeting to order.

To start with, I'd like to thank you all for coming here on a Friday morning. I'm sorry if you had other things to do. More importantly, I'd like to thank you for accepting to serve on this important search committee. I'm sure you will find this to be quite a challenging and interesting exercise.

I'd like to also thank Diane Shumyla, who was very, very helpful in the last search. I'm sure she'll be as helpful this time. Also, I welcome to the committee and thank Alayne Stewart from PAO for being here as a resource person who will also help us, especially in the interviews and selection process. Thank you for coming. We appreciate your input here.

Now, you all received a binder about this morning's meeting, and you have an agenda. I'd just like to ask before we start: are there any items you would like to add or propose to add or delete from the agenda? If not, could we have somebody move it?

MS BARRETT: I'll move it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Moved by Pam that we approve the agenda as circulated. All those in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

Now, like most committees, I believe we should have a deputy chair or vice-chair in case the chairman cannot be present in some instances.

MR. JACQUES: I would move Mr. Gary Friedel as vice-chair.

MR. FRIEDEL: Like I need another job.

MR. SAPERS: He's surprised, yet honoured. I can see that in his eyes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you be prepared to accept, Mr. Friedel?

MR. FRIEDEL: If you promise there's no work involved.

MR. SAPERS: Does he get a car?

MR. JACQUES: You get extra pay too.

MR. FRIEDEL: I wish.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have a motion on the floor. Any other nominations? Those in favour of the motion? The motion is carried. Thank you very much.

Now, the mandate of the committee. If you look in your binder at tab 4, I think it's very plain.

MS BARRETT: It's a done deal, isn't it? It's pretty obvious what we have to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very plain and clear. I don't think we have the authority to change our mandate, but any discussion on the mandate of the committee? Any concerns? If not, we'll put it as an item that was reviewed.

Item 5 in your tab is the tentative timetable and procedures of the search committee. I'll ask Ms Alayne Stewart to maybe give us an overview of what she's prepared here for us.

MS BARRETT: Only if she's willing to tell me where she got that blouse.

MS STEWART: We'll talk later.

MS BARRETT: All right.

MR. JACQUES: I'm not going to ask you where you got it either.

MS BARRETT: First it was Diane and her earrings; now it's Alayne and her blouse.

MS STEWART: What this is is just a tentative schedule and, you know, it's open for discussion. This is more along the lines of the timing a normal search would take, give or take some timing around the number of applicants that we're interviewing. So if there is a larger number of people we're looking at in terms of screening the applications or interviewing people, it may take a little longer, or this might fit, depending on what we're doing.

Again, this was just on my quick review – I put in some dates, too, for the committee – without meeting with you, so don't think that . . .

MS BARRETT: How to eat up our summer.

MS STEWART: That's right.

So I don't want you to think this is cast in stone in any way. It was just giving you a tentative idea of timing on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, certainly. I appreciate you preparing that. I know that we may have to on occasion adjust these dates or revise the whole schedule, but it depends how the search goes. At least it gives us something to start from and a tentative date to shoot for.

MS BARRETT: This looks totally reasonable. When I saw this package yesterday, I thought: well, this meeting ought to last about five minutes. Really it does. But I do have a couple of questions. Paul, do you have any idea – last time we did a search, I wasn't on the committee. Do you remember how many applicants we had, how many were interviewed by the initial interview team, and how many were interviewed by this committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. If you'd like, we can go through this process here and just give you an overview. What we did last time was similar to this committee here. We had a total of 241 applications. These applications all went to Diane or to PAO, and they reviewed all the applicants and did a sorting in three categories: A, B, and C. Then they reported to the committee, and we decided the Cs were the lower qualified persons or those who didn't have a chance that we would consider them. They were sent letters of regret immediately so they wouldn't have to wait. Then the

committee sat down with PAO and Diane, and we looked at the As and Bs, because the As were going to be the people interviewed in the initial interview. We did adjust one or two. If I remember right, one was bumped from a B to an A. Then we selected six applicants – not six; I'm sorry. There were 15 initial interviews. So the staff did that, and then they reported to us on these interviews. Out of that we picked six of them, and the committee as a whole did the final interview along with our support staff. That's how we worked it last time.

MRS. SHUMYLA: That was for the Ombudsman competition. If I can just add to that, I have the report from the Chief Electoral Officer in 1994. For that one we had 218 applications. A short list of 19 candidates was interviewed initially, and then the committee interviewed four finalists.

MS BARRETT: In terms of advertising I assume we'll use the Net. Did I look far enough in my package? I don't think I saw . . .

MRS. SHUMYLA: We did use the Internet for the advertisement for the Ombudsman.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, that's what I thought.

MRS. SHUMYLA: We didn't in 1994, but we did for the last one for the Ombudsman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Something else that we did for the first time, for those of you who are serving. I know Howard served on the other committee, and I did, but for the rest of you, we decided at that time not to follow what had been done in the past and have a national search, professional – what do you call these people? – headhunters, in short, and advertise nationally. The budget for that was close to \$100,000 if you put them both together. So we advertised in Alberta only. There is a budget on that here. We had PAO do a lot of the legwork, and we did the final interviews. I think at the end we probably spent \$6,000 or \$7,000 to put a person in that position, and it turned out well. I intended to recommend to the committee hoping we can follow basically the same route this time.

Yes, Howard?

MR. SAPERS: Well, just looking at the tentative schedule, which I appreciate, this is a real personal bit of micromanagement. The week of May 25 to 29 I won't be available. As of the 30th of May I am, but it's a Saturday. That's all. It's just that that week I won't be available if we stick to the schedule.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, there are only five MLAs on this committee, and we'll try to make a very strong attempt to make sure dates are adjusted so that we can get them to all committees if it's at all possible. If there is some reason why we have to move ahead and we can't delay it, it might happen that one committee member may be absent, but I don't like that. I hope we can adjust and make it fit so that we're all here when we make the big decisions.

MS BARRETT: Can I ask a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

9:13

MS BARRETT: Howard, if the executive search was done prior to the 22nd, would you be available then?

MR. SAPERS: Oh, yes.

MS BARRETT: Oh, good. Okay.

MR. SAPERS: It's just that there are four days in May that I'm not available. That's it.

MS BARRETT: We'll work around it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sure all the other MLAs will have the same concern as we move along. So we'll adjust these things.

MS BARRETT: Not me. I don't get a holiday this year.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think we should have to worry about that today, because as we progress these might have to be changed, not by the absence of committee members but by other items like, you know, how many applicants we get. Okay?

MS BARRETT: Yeah, that's great.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay; we have agreement that we will advertise in Alberta, and we'll do our own search without hiring a headhunter team.

MR. SAPERS: Paul, I'm sorry. I thought we were going to discuss that more fully under that item on the agenda. Did you want to pursue that a little bit?

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll pick that up in a second then.

MS BARRETT: Sure. Let's clear off item 5. I think everybody's happy, eh, that it's cleared off.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Item 6, Draft Position Profile. Again, that was put together by Alayne. In order to assist you so you recognize changes from last time, the changes are highlighted so you can pick them up. If you have any questions on that, maybe we can discuss that now.

MS STEWART: Would you like me to walk through it?

THE CHAIRMAN: If you want to take a minute to do that, maybe just the highlight points. You don't have to read the whole thing.

MS STEWART: On page 1: the change for “manage the Register of Electors through enumerations and a variety of data sources”. That came out of my meeting with the Acting Chief Electoral Officer. I went through the old profile and spent some time just getting some updated information, and that was one of the updates. So it was a change from the previous profile.

The next one: “provide training, guidance.” It was more wording; the same information, just a little cleaner wording on that. The same with the third one: “enforce the need for fairness”. There is an addition on the next one: “prepare and have printed a report . . . election under the Senatorial Selection Act.” That was an addition. Down to “register constituency associations”: the change from 240 to 228. I elaborated “the Election Finances and

Contributions Disclosure Act” just to be a little more specific there.

On page 2 at the top my understanding is that the Chief Electoral Officer is not a member of the commission but “provides advice, information and assistance to the Commission.” That was the change on that one. Then the addition of the word “possible” appointment. In the “Relationship to the Legislative Assembly,” an addition is “a non-partisan” Officer.

Under “Key Responsibilities” it was more the wording in ensuring returning officers and other election officials. So there's wording there.

One I wanted to point out from the old profile. There was a section dealing with more administrative practices that were suggested for deletion from the old profile, and it was:

providing to returning officers and ensuring the return of documents and election materials essential to the conduct of an election, i.e. provides a writ of election, forms, guides, brochures, materials, ballot boxes, ballot paper and lists of electors and ensures the return of these items.

So the suggestion was to delete that as it was more of an administrative process.

The next one, again being consistent with the “Register of Electors” and also including “a variety of data sources” with some of the changes in the processes there.

MR. SAPERS: Could I stop you there for a second?

MS STEWART: Yeah. Sure.

MR. SAPERS: I was reflecting on what you just said about the administrative nature of that one bullet that was deleted. There are a couple of things. I think it's the second point at the top of page 3 and the last point before paragraph 2 starts, the top of page 3. Those activities that you just described, do you think they're included in those two anyway?

MS STEWART: Yes.

MR. SAPERS: Okay. Because these are kind of administrative as well. Okay.

MS STEWART: So what this was is that it fell into those two. That's a very good point.

MR. SAPERS: Thanks.

MS STEWART: Move to paragraph 3. Again it's “recommends modification” versus “modifies.” That's it for that.

I'm trying to go back to the old profile. The pages are different.

MR. SAPERS: In the “recommends modification,” who does the Chief Electoral Officer make those recommendations to? Wouldn't the CEO modify those kinds of things?

MS STEWART: Would it be in consultation with the select standing committee?

MR. SAPERS: It might be with the committee. Paul, you've served on the committee much longer than I have. Would the committee review recommendations to do with the procedures to affect increased . . . I mean, who's job is that? Is that the CEO's job, or is that the committee's job?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think it's both our jobs. If the CEO sees something in the office there through the experience he's getting, then he should come to the committee and recommend some recommendations that would improve the operation. The final decision would probably rest with the Legislative Offices Committee to accept or reject or modify the recommendation or review it. The person on the job that's gaining the day-to-day experience should come up to us, I believe, because there are a lot of day-to-day operations where we don't know where we can recommend improvements.

MR. SAPERS: That's what I mean. If the CEO came to me and said, you know, we really need to put this box on this form on the left side instead of the right side because of all these administrative reasons, I wouldn't know whether that was a good, bad, or indifferent suggestion. I'm just wondering what the practice has been in the past.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can't tell you, Howard.

MS BARRETT: Was the word “modified” before, just “modified”?

MS STEWART: It was “reviews and modifies.”

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MS STEWART: And it changed to “reviews and recommends modification.”

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, maybe Howard has a point. If it's a minor modification that will improve just the operation and not a change in the actual process, I don't think it has to come to the committee. The only time it would come to the committee is if it's a major . . .

MR. JACQUES: Policy matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: . . . policy change from what we've done in the past.

MS STEWART: So stay with the previous wording?

THE CHAIRMAN: Maybe we should, yes.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, I think I would agree with that.

MS STEWART: Okay. So the previous wording said: “reviews and modifies election practices and procedures.”

MR. SAPERS: He reports to us. He or she will report to the committee anyway, and I'm assuming if we didn't like it, we'd say so.

MR. FRIEDEL: What if we took the word “modification” out and put in: reviews and administers? That would be a little different; it wouldn't imply that you go in and you significantly change. That would leave the option for consulting with the committee if there were significant changes, but normally the administration of this kind of practice would assume that he has responsibility to change day-to-day routine things.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your wording was: reviews and . . .

MR. FRIEDEL: I would take out "recommends modification" and say: reviews and administers election practices.

MR. JACQUES: Actually, you could even cut that down and say: administers election practices and procedures in order to effect increased economy.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let's go with administer.

9:23

MS BARRETT: Yeah, whatever. I think we have a common understanding here.

MR. SAPERS: Just change the whole thing to self-starter.

MS BARRETT: That comes two pages later.

MS STEWART: Okay. We can move forward? On the next section, B, the change really is in number 3, which wouldn't be highlighted on there, but there was a point on the previous profile that the first bullet said "maintaining a depository of record for all financial contributions." I understand that that process isn't used any longer, so that was deleted.

In C the change again was related to the member of the commission, so it "provides advice, information and assistance."

The next one is in D, although it isn't highlighted in yours because it was a deletion. The second bullet under D: "The Chief Electoral Officer is responsible for . . . developing and obtaining approval of the annual budget." In the previous profile it said: "and the Three-Year Business Plan." My understanding is that there hasn't been a three-year business plan developed for this area at this point.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you're right. There hasn't been.

MR. FRIEDEL: Why would there not be though?

THE CHAIRMAN: Did we get one with the budget this year?

MR. JACQUES: Yeah, there was.

MRS. SHUMYLA: Excuse me. Most of the other officers have brought forward three-year plans. If we get them, we do, but each office does things differently and sometimes we don't get them.

MR. JACQUES: But we had one for this one; didn't we?

MR. FRIEDEL: I think it would be good practice. I realize it's more difficult for the CEO, because you can't plan around election dates you're not aware of, but as much as possible, I think advanced planning is a good idea.

MS STEWART: So I'll leave it in?

THE CHAIRMAN: What we could do is leave it in here, and if there's a change of cost on that, we should decide that at a bigger level, not at a search level.

MS STEWART: I'm happy with that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. But it might just be good practice to enforce that they all bring in a three-year business plan.

MS STEWART: The next change is under 4, Organization. It was just in A, making the working title consistent with the organizational chart. So the wording changed there. In B, again, "other elections officers"; wording change there. The last part on page 5 there says "Chief Electoral Officer who guides the returning officers." In the previous position profile it said: "who directs the returning officers." That was the wording change on that one.

THE CHAIRMAN: I like that word better than "directs."

MS STEWART: Let's see. Financial and Human Resource Management were updates from 1994 in terms of the numbers and the dates and the amounts. The next one is under Committees/Liaison, and I see "committees" is spelled wrong; it's missing an "e."

The change in number 2, Conference of Canadian Election "Officials," and then the change in the date, "1998 Conference . . . by this office (August)" of this year.

MS BARRETT: Can I ask, Mr. Chairman: is it going to be a problem to do that this year? I guess we can't get out of it, right?

THE CHAIRMAN: There's been a fairly firm commitment, and these things are planned a long time ahead.

MS BARRETT: Usually. I know.

THE CHAIRMAN: If Alberta were to pull out, I don't know what it would do to the whole thing.

MS BARRETT: This is going to be odd: you know, having somebody brand new doing it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know how big that conference is and how many delegates it involves, but I don't think it's a big, big conference.

MR. SAPERS: Probably fewer than a hundred delegates.

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, this reinforces Howard's concern that this person be a self-starter. We'll add: early starter.

THE CHAIRMAN: This one, we're too far in. Derm had committed to two more conferences just in January here. One was between 1,200 to 1,500 delegates, and the other one was 500, 600. We'll have to discuss that at the other committee level. I authorized the acting person to send letters of regret and back out because the budgets for those would be enormous. There's a lot of cost to those, and we didn't have anything in our budget. Derm committed to that on January 21, when he knew that his term was ending, so we just backed out. One is a world conference, not just North America; it is a world conference.

So I asked to find out where I stood on this thing. I didn't have time to call the committee. I asked Brian to phone across Canada. The only other province that looked after hosting this one time was Ontario about three years ago. They backed down because they said they didn't have the resources, and they thought the budget was so enormous that they didn't want to confront it. So for small Alberta compared to Ontario, I felt it proper just to back out of it.

MS BARRETT: Plus, I had forgotten that we do have an acting CEO.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anyway, there are going to be letters of correspondence in our package when we meet with everybody on the committee.

MS STEWART: The next change on the profile is under section B, Liaison, just the addition of "and related department representatives."

Now, the issues area. I don't know whether there might be other issues. This was more just a quick update from the 1994 profile, so again it was changing the wording to the "Register of Electors," the implementation of that process. The deletion from the previous profile was related to "oversee the implementation of revised electoral boundaries" and the update, "a provincial election prior to April, 2002."

I don't know if there were other issues that the committee wanted to put in there.

MR. SAPERS: Would you flag the potential for by-elections? It's something that sort of goes without saying.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's not in there someplace?

MS STEWART: It is in the other part, under responsibilities.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah. I think that's sufficient.

MS BARRETT: I do too.

MS STEWART: Okay. The Issues section is just to highlight, perhaps, some areas that are going to be upcoming.

MR. JACQUES: I just noticed under A and B: one is "responsible for maintaining the Register," and the other is "oversee the implementation of."

MS STEWART: Maybe combine those?

MR. JACQUES: Yeah. I'm just wondering why we would . . . Is there something back in '94 because of the proposed change in the way that . . .

MS BARRETT: I think I know what you're getting at. It's about the permanent registry?

MR. JACQUES: Yeah. Is that why?

MS BARRETT: Yeah. If I'm not mistaken, Paul, we don't have it yet, but what we're probably going to tag on to this tax year is the federal one. If you've done your income tax, you'll note the first question. They don't even want to know who you are anymore. They want to know if you want to be on their permanent registry. So I think that was the idea, if I'm not mistaken, Paul.

MR. FRIEDEL: So you're suggesting, Wayne, that the two be combined?

MR. JACQUES: No. I was just questioning it. It's unusual to see both "implementation" and "maintaining" right there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if you maintain it, it looks after the implementation.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. I think the implementation really refers to the new permanent registry that we're moving towards. Am I wrong, Alayne?

MS STEWART: You know, from your asking the question, I think perhaps those two could be combined, seeing as how they're dealing with the same subject area.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MR. SAPERS: Responsible for maintaining and overseeing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll want to do that.

MS STEWART: Now, the term of office: that information is just directly out of the legislation. I pulled that out, so I don't know if you want to make any adjustments to the wording or leave it the way it is.

9:33

THE CHAIRMAN: They took that out of the act. We can't change the act.

MS STEWART: I wondered if you wanted me to put it in different terms.

THE CHAIRMAN: We may be challenged if we try that.

MS STEWART: Now, moving to The Person, I want to just let you know that you won't recognize it from the previous profile. What I did was went in and looked at the functions that you're looking at, someone performing the high level of work that's involved here. This is based on previous experiences and putting together qualifications for people to do that type of work. So this could be quite a discussion area.

THE CHAIRMAN: So this is new from the last profile.

MS STEWART: This is very new from the last profile.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, maybe you should just read them one by one, and if we have a problem, we'll stop you.

MS STEWART: Uh-huh. That sounds good. We can go through each one.

- practical related senior management experience along with proven ability to manage complex human and financial resources;
- experience managing administrative operations of an organization;
- working knowledge of administrative and records management processes and computer systems.

THE CHAIRMAN: Computer systems there is very important. I don't think you can run the office without that knowledge nowadays.

MS STEWART:

- working knowledge of legislation and the ability to interpret and apply appropriately;
- understanding of financial management practices and procedures to include financial statements, budgets and audit techniques;
- demonstrated ability to build and maintain excellent working relationships with volunteers, volunteer organizations and a wide variety of stakeholders.

MS BARRETT: That was good lingo. I'd like to compliment you on that. There's another one that's good lingo as well, but that's particularly good.

MS STEWART: Thank you.

- related senior level experience administering election processes would be an asset.

MR. FRIEDEL: Since we're at the end of that section, I see that you have in the last bullet "related senior level experience." Then going to the first bullet, the "practical related senior management" seems to be more arbitrary. I'm not so sure that the word "related" should be in the first bullet, because if you're going to follow that literally, it would mean that someone would have to have had previous electoral experience in order to be qualified. The last bullet said "would be an asset," which is definitely correct.

MS BARRETT: I would agree with you, Gary, actually. I think that should be moved.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So in the first bullet we delete the word "related." I think that's a good comment.

MS STEWART: Good. Thanks.

Okay, Personal Qualities. "Strong verbal, written and listening communications skills."

MS BARRETT: That was my other compliment for you, the "listening."

MS STEWART: Thanks.

"Ability to exercise and analyze problems."

MS BARRETT: I must say that I'm curious about the word "exercise" there.

MS STEWART: Right.

MS BARRETT: Can you do your calisthenics?

MS STEWART: Isn't that interesting.

MR. SAPERS: Maybe it's to excise problems.

MS BARRETT: Well, you analyze first, then you excise.

MS STEWART: Maybe it's ability to analyze problems.

MS BARRETT: I think it's probably more like that.

MR. SAPERS: Or maybe it was two bullets. Ability to exercise.

MR. FRIEDEL: I actually think it was spelled wrong.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. That's what Howard said.

MS STEWART: So we'll delete "exercise and"?

MS BARRETT: Why don't you put "analyze and solve"? I don't want an analyst. I want somebody who can fix it in the heat of an election.

THE CHAIRMAN: And solve or deal with problems.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Whatever. You know what I'm getting at.

MR. JACQUES: "Analytical skills" is another way out.

MS STEWART: Yeah. The previous one said ability to analyze situations and ability to analyze information.

MR. SAPERS: I wonder if it was just a slip in the word processor and if it would have been ability to exercise sound judgment and analyze problems.

MS BARRETT: You know what? That would work.

MS STEWART: That must be it, because judgment isn't on the . . .

MS BARRETT: Well, it's the next one down that you see. I'll bet you that's what happened. That makes sense.

MS STEWART: So ability to exercise judgment and analyze problems?

MS BARRETT: Sound judgment.

MR. SAPERS: Yeah. We wouldn't want it any other way.

MS BARRETT: This is correct.

MS STEWART: Okay. And we'll delete "sound judgment" from the next bullet.

The next one: "Common sense approach, tactful, patient, self-confident, fair, mature and tolerant." These were from the previous one. Is that something you want in there?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MS STEWART: Okay.

- Demonstrates flexibility and capacity to be open to new ideas.
- Public orientation – sensitive to current needs and future expectations.
- Leader and coach in developing individuals and teams.
- Sound decision making and administrative skills.

MR. FRIEDEL: You're missing the wings and halo.

MR. SAPERS: Yeah, but Gary now has a job.

There was one thing, and I don't know whether it's captured. Maybe again it goes without saying, because it's such a term-specific kind of office, but something about the fact that this is – you know, the flexibility and almost even the transient nature of the position. On the one hand you're recruiting a very senior manager but also somebody who you're not really encouraging to put down roots.

MS BARRETT: That's in the job description, Howard, that's next. It's in the next section.

MR. SAPERS: Yeah, but a lot of this stuff is. I'm just wondering whether something like that could be reflected here.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't follow exactly what you mean, that we're not encouraging them to put down roots. You mean that it's too short a term of office?

MR. SAPERS: No, no. I'm not questioning that part of it at all. It's just that the job is just as likely to terminate a year after an election as it is to continue. So we're recruiting somebody for arguably three to five years.

MS BARRETT: Could I just offer? Where she clipped from the act, I think that makes it very clear.

MS STEWART: The term of office?

MS BARRETT: The term of office, but I was wrong. Sorry, everybody. It's not in the proposed ad, and I think that's where it needs to be made clear. It's already referred to here. I've no problem with that, but it's not in here actually.

MS STEWART: Are you getting at perhaps putting that it's contract employment or a contract appointment?

MR. SAPERS: Well, not even that it's contract employment, but you want the kind of person who's – I mean, the closest that it comes to is under personal qualities where it says “flexibility.” It's been very difficult for the incumbent to recognize the termination. The job comes up 12 months after an election, and I just think it might be worth while to emphasize that in a slightly different way than it is under Term of Office.

MS BARRETT: I have no problem with doing that. It's way more important that it be made clear in the ad.

MR. JACQUES: We could put something like job security is equal to that of an MLA.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, pretty well, except we don't get 12 months after the election.

MR. SAPERS: I was going to say that it's way better, unless you know of something that I don't know about. I think it's 12 seconds after the election.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, something like that.

MR. SAPERS: Well, maybe I'm just being too sensitive to the current circumstances.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know what you mean, but it's very plain in here. I also believe that those who apply for the job are really looking to term of office.

MS BARRETT: I think most serious applicants would understand that.

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, I'm sure the ones that are going to qualify under the requirements and qualities will have read this document.

MR. JACQUES: But that's also the area too, in the interview process, where you can very quickly pick up if that's an issue.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So we went through the whole document.

MS STEWART: I only have one question which I did not put in the profile, but sometimes we do put it in the profile. It's related to remuneration. It's more a question mark for me. I put something in the advertisement, again only for discussion. I don't know whether you want it in or not. We certainly do run advertisements that don't have it in, so it wouldn't be uncommon. I wondered if you wanted to put something related to remuneration in the position profile that says: this appointment offers a salary up

to X dollar amount dependent upon the qualifications of the candidate.

9:43

MR. SAPERS: Well, if it's not the first it's the second question that every candidate's going to ask in one way or another. If it's tied to a range, why not put it in the profile, and that way people don't have to wonder.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm glad you brought that up. Yesterday when we got our binders in the House, I discussed it with Wayne, who sits next to me. I'm concerned that we have in the ad that you'll be paid according to your qualifications. It might bring expectations that are not there, and if we had a range in the profile . . .

MS STEWART: Okay.

MR. JACQUES: Well, Paul and I were discussing to perhaps leave that sentence in the ad . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: And have it in the profile.

MS STEWART: Yeah. That's not uncommon.

MR. JACQUES: . . . and then put it in the profile, because those that would be interested would apply and get the profile.

MR. SAPERS: They get the package of information.

MS BARRETT: Absolutely right. Good thinking.

THE CHAIRMAN: So are you unanimous on that? Good. We'll include that.

MS STEWART: So we'll include the salary range.

Now, I know that the salary range is based on what is developed by the committee. Is there a salary range to include in there at this point, or is that something you could get back to me with?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we do have a chart on that, but I didn't bring it this morning.

MS STEWART: Is it in the senior officials' salary range listing?

MRS. SHUMYLA: In the past it was the senior officials' listing, category C, I believe. That range was used.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gary has served on this committee probably the longest. You probably know more about this salary range than I do. In the past I guess the committee tried to . . .

MR. JACQUES: Well, category C, if that's it. It's prescribed.

MS STEWART: There is a prescribed range.

MR. FRIEDEL: That's right. There is a range, but there have been overriding practices at which end of the range these officers are placed in. I don't recall that too many of them started at the bottom of the scale. I think the feeling was that anyone who would barely qualify for the job wasn't likely the person we wanted. So they tended to be in the upper portion of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. If we agree with the changes that were made, I'd like to have a motion that we approve the profile so that we get on record that Diane can send out the application.

MR. SAPERS: So moved.

THE CHAIRMAN: Moved by Howard. Any discussion on the motion? Those in favour of the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. Thank you.

The draft advertisement and advertising media to be used: that's item 7 in your binder. What Alayne did there is give you the ad that was used in the previous search in 1994. The first page is her revised ad that she's proposing to use this time. There's no major change in this whole ad; right?

MS STEWART: There's a major change in it.

MR. SAPERS: And the line we just deleted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. We'll go through that.

MS STEWART: Oh, sorry. From the previous ad to the new ad I didn't bold and italicize because it was completely different.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the wording is, but the whole intent of the ad is basically the same thing.

MS STEWART: Now, there are some qualification changes that we've just gone through from the profile, and that, too, will get updated.

MS BARRETT: Good. I think the only change I would recommend is reference to the computer, the need to be computer literate.

MR. SAPERS: Year 2000 compliant.

MS BARRETT: Well, computer literate. Working with computer systems in other words.

THE CHAIRMAN: That should be in here.

MR. JACQUES: It is here.

MS BARRETT: Is it there? I didn't see it.

MR. JACQUES: Down in the third paragraph.

MS BARRETT: There it is. Computer systems. Sorry, Wayne. All right. You beat me to it then.

MS STEWART: So you're okay with the top part, and maybe we should just spend some time on the qualifications part to make sure we're consistent with the profile.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. We have agreement to delete "Salary is dependent on qualifications and experience."

MS STEWART: Right.

So after "the ideal candidate will possess," I'll delete "related."
The ideal candidate will possess senior management experience along with proven ability to manage complex human and financial

resources. You will have demonstrated experience in records management, computer systems, and a working knowledge of legislation and conducting inquiries.

Did that part flow okay?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS STEWART: Okay.

Excellent verbal, written and interpersonal communication skills are required to build and maintain positive working relationships with volunteers, volunteer organizations and a wide variety of stakeholders.

Are there are other areas from the profile that you'd like to add there?

MR. JACQUES: The only one I was wondering about is the very last one, where it said, "related senior level experience . . . would be an asset," and whether you want it.

MS STEWART: Oh, seeing as how we deleted the "related" in the top part for experience.

MR. JACQUES: The point is simply that we haven't referred to it being an asset or not. If that's not an important item – it's the last one on here, which means it's probably the last consideration.

MS STEWART: Well, it would be considered in combination with the other.

MR. JACQUES: But if it is important, my only comment is that I thought something similar should be in here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I think it should be put in there somehow.

MR. SAPERS: Direct elections experience would be an asset: is that what you're saying?

MR. JACQUES: Yeah, something to that effect.

MS STEWART: We had: "related senior level experience administering election processes would be an asset." Do you want to include that then? That is the last sentence in that paragraph.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

I have a couple of other concerns in that paragraph. One is about the volunteers: "working relationships with volunteers, volunteer organizations." Most of the people that this CEO would work with are the returning officers and the poll clerks and the people who are paid for the job. In an election process I don't think we have volunteers. If we have scrutineers, they're volunteers on behalf of the candidate. They're not there on behalf of the office of the CEO.

MR. JACQUES: Yeah, but the constituency organizations he deals with are all volunteers.

MR. SAPERS: All the filing of the candidate's undertakings, all those things.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was thinking of the election day, but on that side, yeah.

MR. SAPERS: But would it be more proper to say political organizations or political volunteer organizations?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, "volunteers" to me opens the door to a lot. But maybe if we put "political organizations."

MR. SAPERS: Because volunteers come with political organizations and a wide variety of stakeholders.

MS STEWART: Okay. Instead of "volunteer organizations," put "political organizations."

MR. SAPERS: And maybe make that change in the description.

MS STEWART: Sure, in the profile too.

THE CHAIRMAN: My other concern was that "computer systems" comes after "records management." I wonder if it's not more important. I think it's an integral part of the whole operation. When we're talking about \$500,000 for a new computer system, it's a very, very important part of the whole operation, and the person in charge of it should be very conversant in that whole system. Otherwise, I don't know how you can stay on top of your job.

MS STEWART: So just change the order there to: "You will have demonstrated experience in computer systems, records management, and a working knowledge."

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah. If it was first, it might highlight it a little more.

MS BARRETT: Sorry, Paul. I didn't get this \$500,000 in new computers. Is this something that's being done now?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, no, but it was on the budget last time. The previous CEO was looking at that type of system, and that was the general cost of it. You know, the computer system in that office is very, very elaborate if you're going to update it.

9:53

MS BARRETT: Don't you usually bring in tech people? I mean, I remember when we first got Bill Gano, for example. I think I had the only computer in the building in '86.

MR. JACQUES: That was an abacus.

MS BARRETT: No, it was a Compaq actually. Anyway, I'd had it from '82, when I was a researcher.

When Members' Services first started contemplating computerization, systems were something that people just couldn't fathom. Right? I think you were around, Diane; you might remember it. So we had to bring in, had to create a department called information systems. Usually, if you're talking about going into a network, it's not the boss that knows how to run the network; it's the technical person who does. So I'm thinking that records management might stay first. Do you know what I'm getting at? Systems are systems, man. You have a highly technical person come in who knows, not the boss. The boss doesn't.

MR. JACQUES: It is of interest when one reverses the profile, because in the profile we say "working knowledge of administrative and records management . . . and computer systems." Here we said, "a working knowledge of legislation and conducting inquiries" but "demonstrated experience." So we're not consistent with the profile.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. That's what worries me actually.

MR. JACQUES: I would tend to lean with the profile. I think a working knowledge is really what you're looking for. You're not looking for a computer analyst or a programmer, but you want to have somebody that has a working knowledge.

MS BARRETT: I'd be happy with that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. You adjust the wording, then, to reflect the profile wording, and I think that will satisfy the committee members.

MS STEWART: Okay. So "working knowledge" rather than "demonstrated experience."

MR. JACQUES: Yeah.

MS STEWART: The only comment I would have on that is that when you do have applications in and we as a committee are reviewing them or looking at who would get an interview versus who wouldn't, it might be a little easier if you're looking at experience over working knowledge. Sometimes it's a little harder to make that assessment from what someone presents in a résumé. That would be my only caution on that one. I might look for other things through the experience that they've listed through our preliminary interviews and gathering.

MR. SAPERS: But it's not likely that somebody who had all the other management skills that we're looking for would present themselves with no working knowledge today. Right?

MS STEWART: That's true.

THE CHAIRMAN: In today's age, yeah. It's not a problem.

MS STEWART: Yeah. I guess I was anticipating 241 applications.

MS BARRETT: You're probably going to get them too, Alayne.

MR. SAPERS: But, you know, for the ones that answer the ad off the Internet, I think we can just take that as a given.

MS STEWART: Yeah, for the ones who send it to Diane by E-mail.

MR. SAPERS: If you get E-mail applications, they get a little asterisk.

MR. FRIEDEL: Besides, you've heard this discussion, and you I'm sure will be leaving here with a perfect understanding of what we want.

MS STEWART: Exactly. There's no question.

MR. JACQUES: I was looking at the E-mail address.

MS BARRETT: It's to Diane.

MR. JACQUES: Yeah.

MRS. SHUMYLA: That's how we had it for the Ombudsman competition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So we're done with the ad?

MS BARRETT: Yes, please.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Could we have a motion to support that? Moved by Pam. Those in favour? Against? It's carried.

Now we'll look at the advertising media to be used. On the next page you have a list of Alberta dailies that are itemized here along with the cost of the ads to be run. We have a total budget price of \$5,875.30.

MS BARRETT: I have a question, Paul.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS BARRETT: It looks like an appropriate budget, pretty standard. The travel though: I assume that's to pay travel expenses for people coming in for interviews.

MR. SAPERS: You're a section ahead of us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Now we're still in section 7, and we're on the second page.

MS BARRETT: The ads. Oh, yeah. Sorry.

THE CHAIRMAN: The budget for the ads and the list of the dailies that we're going to use. On top of that, it's understood that we'd put it on the Internet, like we did last time, so that we get good coverage.

Yes, Howard.

MR. SAPERS: Paul, similar, I guess, to my feelings when we did the Ombudsman search, which worked out well, my concern is that we are not casting a broad enough net with just Alberta-only advertising. I would like to move that we include an ad in the *Globe and Mail*, which seems to me to be a very cost-effective way of getting a hard-copy ad across the country. I don't think the cost is prohibitive, given the exposure that we want. In some cases it's probably more important for the Chief Electoral Officer than it was for the Ombudsman. There's a much smaller galaxy of people, I would imagine, out there that have some related experience in managing elections, and I'd like to have it known pretty far and wide that Alberta is searching for someone with the excellent qualities we're looking for. So my suggestion would be to approve this with the addition of an insertion in the *Globe and Mail*.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that point, Diane, last time we had a budget for national advertising and we had the *Globe and Mail* in there, do you remember what the price was?

MRS. SHUMYLA: Yes, for the last competition we did advertise in the *Globe and Mail*. Do you have the cost with you?

MS STEWART: I have that. Yeah, I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: For the competition for the CEO?

MS STEWART: No, not for the CEO. I'm sorry. I didn't bring the costs on that one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did we go with the *Globe and Mail*?

MRS. SHUMYLA: Yes. For the CEO in 1994 we did go with the *Globe and Mail*, but I do not have the cost here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS STEWART: The only thing I brought with me was when we did an estimate for the Ombudsman. We did an estimate to also include the *Globe and Mail*, although we did not use that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. What was that?

MS STEWART: The estimate was \$6,000, and we paid \$6,700 for all the Alberta dailies.

MR. JACQUES: For one ad?

MS STEWART: Yes.

MR. SAPERS: Well, it is Canada's national newspaper.

MR. JACQUES: Oh, right.

MR. SAPERS: You know I'm no show for that publisher, but I really do feel it would be important. I don't know whether the \$6,000 or \$7,000 is negotiable. I don't know if that was a Friday, Saturday. I don't know if that was a Friday only. The size can vary, but it seems to me that we should explore it.

MRS. SHUMYLA: I believe that the *Globe and Mail* will run the same ad and they run it twice, and that's the only way they'll run it.

MS STEWART: We don't have a choice. When you submit your ad, they put in the standard number of insertions, and I don't recall whether it's two. I think it's two.

MRS. SHUMYLA: I believe it was two.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We've had discussion from Howard. Any other comments?

Yes, Gary.

MR. FRIEDEL: Based strictly on the cost of it – I can appreciate that there's good optics to it – if we want better exposure, we could double the number of insertions in Alberta and probably get a lot more exposure if we just wanted to spend 6,000 bucks. I'm not averse to keeping the search predominantly within Alberta, and I'm sure that people in related offices in the other provinces would be very aware that a job like this is going to come up. We don't want to spend 6,000 bucks to do it.

MS BARRETT: I'll tell you why I'm inclined to agree. May I speak?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS BARRETT: I'm inclined to agree partly because there's a whole network of professionals and word spreads and partly because the Net itself is so widely used now. I've got a whole bunch of roommates in this place that I'm renting right now, and two of them are constantly looking for work. They're taking my computer time, you know; they're on the Net looking for work. It's so common now, I think, plus you know how people talk in between Legislatures. You phone somebody up to do a bit of

research and say: oh, by the way, did you know that such and such a position is available? It just happens. I really think that, Howard.

10:03

MR. SAPERS: Well, yeah. I don't want to belabour it. I think we should make it more formal than happenstance. I agree that there's a network. I agree that there'll be lots of chat between offices. I won't be surprised at all if we get some candidates applying from outside of the province. I just think that it's too narrow to focus on. You could say the same thing: "Let's just put an ad in the *Calgary Herald* and save ourselves \$5,000."

MS BARRETT: I know. It is an arbitrary thing. I know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wayne, you have a comment.

MR. JACQUES: Well, my feeling when I looked at this to begin with was, I guess, questioning whether we should go outside the province. Then when I thought about it – and I guess some of my thoughts were very similar to those that have been expressed – there is a large network out there. Let's face it; that's probably how 80 percent of positions are filled today anyway. Certainly with the Internet we're dealing with a different circumstance than we were four years ago, I think, in terms of both issues.

So, I mean, I wouldn't feel uncomfortable not going outside the province. I think by doing what we're doing fairly widely within the province, combined with the networking and the Internet, those that are interested in a proactive sense would pick up on one of those other two ways if they're not in the province.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we haven't started advertising yet. I have about five phone calls that came in. I don't know if you got any.

MRS. SHUMYLA: I've had a few as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: They're saying: when are you advertising? There's even one from the Northwest Territories. So it seems like this thing is just spreading.

MRS. SHUMYLA: I've had one from Saskatchewan as well as from Alberta.

MR. SAPERS: Well, maybe we could just do a couple of news hits, you know. Get Brian Laghi to interview you and then go in the *Globe* anyway.

MS BARRETT: Sure. What the heck. We'll find you a hook, Paul. We'll find you a hook to get Brian.

MR. JACQUES: Do a news release with some controversial statement in it.

MR. SAPERS: I'll storm out of the meeting room in a fit.

MS BARRETT: Announce that you're not running federally. That'll be it.

MR. SAPERS: I know what I'll do. I'll go tell the *Globe* that the committee made a decision to specifically exclude the *Globe* from its advertising.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We should look at the other part of the budget. Let's approve the budget as one motion.

Howard, that was a discussion point; that was not a motion.

MR. SAPERS: Well, I had phrased it as: I will move. I don't know that you actually recognized it as a motion, Mr. Chairman, and obviously it's the chair's prerogative to do as you will.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I did not. My point was: did you want to make a motion at this time?

MS BARRETT: I'll move adoption of the advertising budget. We have to do the advertising first; right?

THE CHAIRMAN: The advertisement budget only.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. I'll move it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favour of the advertisement budget?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Thank you very much.

Now let's look at the overall budget. Part of it is the advertising budget, and the total budget there is \$21,477. These figures are probably high because they were put in by the staff to make sure that we're safe in the cost. I know with the experience we had with the Ombudsman, we came under the budget. I don't know if there's any big discussion.

MS BARRETT: Yup. I do have a question. That brings me back to that travel one. Is that money allocated to, you know, either bus or fly people in for interviews? Is that what that is?

MRS. SHUMYLA: The travel is for MLA travel, their travel expenses back and forth to meetings, and travel time if necessary. I estimated seven meetings, so for the MLAs who are out of the city, it would be travel time. I put it in. Usually it's not all used, but we estimate as if everyone would claim for each meeting. The interview expenses, \$2,000, are in the event we have to pay for a candidate coming from Calgary or whatever.

MS BARRETT: Good.

MR. FRIEDEL: Just to clarify, though – and you addressed it a little bit earlier, Paul – while the travel budget is in there for the MLAs, you also mentioned that previous experience is that it's rarely used, certainly to the extent of the budget. I know I've sat on the overall committee of Leg. Offices and several search committees and I've never claimed a travel budget, but I know they put it in all the time because it's there for us to use. Invariably we're down here for something else. If we match up meetings with times, we're in Edmonton anyway.

MR. JACQUES: I was going to say that I would never charge them for this; I would just put it through on my straight MLA travel.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that's what I usually do also.

MS BARRETT: I wasn't questioning that. I have a very principled position. An old buddy of mine, an engineer, paid to fly from Edmonton to Montreal for an interview for a job he didn't get, and that bugged me. I don't believe that an applicant who's worthy of

interviewing should have to pay for his or her own travel to the interview.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the Ombudsman search we had one fellow from Yukon who flew in, and we paid the travel. He was the only person from out of the province. If we, in the last four or five interviews, choose a candidate we think is worthy, we should pay the expense of bringing them here.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. That's what I was really looking for.

THE CHAIRMAN: There's money in here to do that.

MS BARRETT: Good. That's all I care about.

THE CHAIRMAN: If we have more out-of-province candidates and \$2,000 is not enough, we'll have a lot of money left in the MLA travel: \$5,400. So I think we have a budget here which can look after any circumstances that may come up.

Can I have a motion to adopt the budget?

MR. JACQUES: I just have one question on wages. Is that from the PAO? Are there cross charges here? Is that what happens?

THE CHAIRMAN: No. I'll ask Diane to comment on that.

MRS. SHUMYLA: Actually, what that is for is that right now in the House services and committee area we have a lot of work and not enough people, and we have a university student there who is on wages right now, working part-time and going to school. That position may revert to STEP, meaning Legislative Assembly won't pay. But in the event we need wages, we were asked if we could include a bit of wage money in this budget – as well, I had asked Gary Friedel if we could do it in the information and privacy committee budget – just to help the Legislative Assembly to have a bit of assistance over the summer for students.

MR. JACQUES: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: So it's really \$4,000 split in two.

MS BARRETT: That's one good thing about being on a committee with you. There won't be any overlap.

MR. FRIEDEL: Absolutely. Everybody's so efficient here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Pam made a motion.

MS BARRETT: Yes, I did. I moved adoption of the budget.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. All those in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

Now, we're down to Other Business, and I'd just like to have one bit of a general discussion here.

MR. JACQUES: I have something that I'd like to move in camera on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. You have to leave?

MR. SAPERS: Yeah.

MR. LANGEVIN: Okay. I'll be there very quickly. My discussion is: are we agreed that we follow basically what we did

with the Ombudsman? For those who were not here – I think I mentioned it before – we had the ad. Then we had the applications come in to Diane's office, and it was handled by PAO. They did the shortlist thing. They divided them into three categories: A, B, and C. The Cs got a letter of regret immediately so they didn't hang and wait, because in our opinion they had no chance of being in the interview process.

MRS. SHUMYLA: They would have gotten a letter of regret after the committee had met and agreed to the screening.

MS BARRETT: Yes. It's right in here. It's in our timetable.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then the only question is the profile document. If we have 250 applications and we send that to all applicants, that's a lot of paperwork, that's a lot of work for the staff, and that's also a lot of cost in the mailing. What I'd like to suggest is that for any applicant who phones in to the office, to myself or Diane, and asks for a profile, we should mail it immediately. For those who don't ask for it at all, I don't think there's a need to mail it. If they're not interested in seeing a profile, maybe they're not the candidates that we will be interviewing anyway. If at the end of day, when they do the shortlist for the first 15 or 19 interviews, there is a person or two on there that did not get a profile, we'd make sure they get it before the interviews. Otherwise, we're going to send out 250 of these documents for very little use.

MRS. SHUMYLA: And just to clarify further, for everyone who applies, what I did is send an acknowledgement letter saying: we have received your application; thank you very much. That's where I had attached the profile, to those. Then in the meantime, people who were really keen would phone also, ahead of time, and want a profile.

MR. SAPERS: So you sent out a letter to everybody anyway. So you sent out 250 pieces of mail anyway.

MRS. SHUMYLA: Yes, I did. I did to acknowledge their application, but then we would also have to send to all the candidates we regret, so most people got two letters: one to say thank you and one to say sorry, you won't be considered further.

10:13

THE CHAIRMAN: But in this instance, they would only get the letter; they would not get the profile. That's what I'm asking for agreement on.

MR. FRIEDEL: But anyone who asks for information will get it. We're just not going to send it out.

MR. SAPERS: It will be downloadable for anyone?

MRS. SHUMYLA: That I will have to check on with our systems people, but I sent it out every way: you know, faxed it to people or they picked it up or I mailed it. I would have to check with our systems people.

MR. FRIEDEL: That might be not a bad idea. If we're going to be sure that it's going to be on the Internet, that might be one way of making sure that for anyone who wants it, simply by telephone you could find out whether they can pick it off the Internet. It would save a lot of time.

MRS. SHUMYLA: That's something that I'd have to further investigate with our systems area, whether they can do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. You want to do that then?

MRS. SHUMYLA: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

You had an in camera?

MR. JACQUES: Yeah, if we could quickly. It's a very quick item.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a motion?

MR. JACQUES: I move that we move in camera.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have a motion to move in camera. All in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Thank you.

[The committee met in camera from 10:14 to 10:16]

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other business?

MR. FRIEDEL: I move that we adjourn.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a motion by Gary that we adjourn. All in favour? Carried.

[The committee adjourned at 10:17 a.m.]

